

A Day and Ten Months in the Life of a Lonely Bachelor: The Other Byzantium in *Miracula S. Artemii* 18 and 22

STEPHANOS EFTHYMIADES

The modern reader of the *Miracles of St. Artemios* should not seek sophistication in their language or style, but in the frequent use of a quite complicated narrative technique. Written in the last decade of Constans II's reign (641–668) by a Constantinopolitan author, they have come down to us as forty-five units stitched together in the manner of an anthology.¹ Despite their simple language and style, thematically, most of the miracles, while not devoid of stereotypes and clichés, are not formulaic, straightforward *miracula*, but elaborate accounts with variegated plots. In other words, commonplaces have been replaced by a composite way of achieving the story's necessarily happy ending. Moreover, their demotic character or down-to-earth depiction of reality, emphasized by various means (social status of the heroes, long dialogues, or grotesque situations), does not necessarily imply a simplistic and clumsy narrative structure.² On the contrary, by their propensity for empirical details, the *Miracula* of St. Artemios represent a significant development in the genre of miracle collections.

Committing these forty-five stories to writing, the author avoided the standardized and impersonal nature of collections like the *Miracles of Sts. Kosmas and Damianos*, as well as the rhetorical prose of Sophronios of Jerusalem in the *Miracles of Sts. Kyros and Ioannes*. Likewise the composition of both miracle collections of St. Demetrios was shaped by the

I am indebted to Profs. Constantine Pitsakis and Anthony Kaldellis who made many useful remarks regarding this study. Thanks are also due to the two anonymous readers and to Dr. A.-M. Talbot for their instructive comments. Needless to say, I am solely responsible for omissions and mistakes.

¹ The *editio princeps* of the collection is by A. Papadopoulos-Kerameus, *Varia Graeca Sacra* (St. Petersburg, 1909), 1–75 (repr. Leipzig, 1975). An English translation and commentary were recently published by V. S. Crisafulli and J. W. Nesbitt, *The Miracles of St. Artemios. A Collection of Miracle Stories by an Anonymous Author of Seventh-Century Byzantium*, The Medieval Mediterranean 13 (Leiden–New York–Cologne, 1997), with an essay by J. F. Haldon; a new critical edition and French translation are awaited from Vincent Déroche. For the reader's convenience, page and line references in this article will be made to the book by Crisafulli and Nesbitt, which reprints the Greek text of the Papadopoulos-Kerameus edition.

² See A. Kazhdan, *A History of Byzantine Literature (650–850)* (Athens, 1999), 27–35, esp. 34–35; also published as “Miracles of St. Artemios,” in *ΑΕΤΟΣ. In Honour of Cyril Mango*, ed. I. Ševčenko and I. Hutter (Stuttgart–Leipzig, 1998), 200–209.

authors' concern to connect a cult with the fate of a particular city, rather than to foster interest in the healed patients themselves.³

Being rather brief and simple in the first sixteen stories, for the remaining part the author of the *Miracula S. Artemii* exploited to the greatest lengths the narrative conventions of the genre. He anticipated and often disappointed the reader's immediate expectations in order either to produce a comic effect or to hint at situations beyond those limited to the activity of a healing center. Also, in several instances, he avoided the convention of hagiographical storytelling and discourse altogether. Good examples are Mir. 17, which relates the misfortunes of an Alexandrian actor in a comic fashion, and Mir. 21, which refers to Stephen, deacon of Hagia Sophia and poet of the Blue faction, the only story to use the mode of first-person narration.

Among a total of forty-five stories three groups are exceptional in that they recount the sufferings of a single person in considerable detail. Mir. 38–40 deal with George (with the nickname Koutales), who is presented as suffering from various diseases in three different phases of his life. Another George, *chartoularios* of the imperial *logothesion*, is the protagonist of the short Mir. 19 and 20. Finally, Mir. 18 and 22 depict one day and ten months respectively in the life of an anonymous chanter who during the reign of Emperor Herakleios sang the *kontakia* of Romanos the Melode. A reason why miraculous episodes about one and the same person were included in this or any miracle collection may be sought in the author's intention to highlight the lifelong bond linking an individual with a wonder-working saint. Be that as it may, it can be further asked why the author did not relate the two stories about the chanter in a sequence as he did with the other two figures; lacking a firm explanation, we may surmise that in this instance his intention was to leave the impression of a certain distance in time separating the two stories. For, if the second episode can be placed in the hero's old age, the first one must have occurred much earlier.

In addition to some observations made by recent translators,⁴ the first of the two stories (Mir. 18) has recently attracted the interest of some scholars, but merely on specific points and not as a whole. A lengthy exposé of the story was provided by Michael Whitby, who argued in favor of an identification of Theophylact, the *subadiuva* and devotee of St. John's parish, with the seventh-century historian Theophylact Simocatta. Apart from the name, both persons shared such common characteristics as holding a judicial office and strong Christian feelings. Of course, the identification proposed, as Whitby himself admits, is hypothetical.⁵ Paul Speck also examined the same miracle but mostly for its "dream" section alluding to an icon of St. John the Baptist on which the bachelor appears to take an oath. In an article complementing and corroborating his previous views that references to icons as in St. Artemios's collection are ninth- or tenth-century interpolations, he held that the "second oath portion" did not figure in the original composition of Mir. 18 since it contradicted the continuation and conclusion of the story; moreover, some fur-

³ The idiosyncratic character of the *Miracles of St. Artemios* compared to other collections was noted by V. Deroche, "Pourquoi écrivait-on des recueils de miracles? L'exemple des miracles de Saint Artémios," in *Les saints et leurs sanctuaires: Textes, images et monuments*, Byzantina Sorbonensis 11 (Paris, 1993), 95–99; and Kazhdan, *History*, 29–30, who considered a main difference the lack of compositional unity.

⁴ Crisafulli and Nesbitt, 251–55.

⁵ M. Whitby, "Theophylact the Historian and the Miracles of Artemius," *Electrum* 1 (1997): 221–34.

ther details, for instance, the insertion of the thief's brother wearing the stolen clothes, confirm that the extant form of Mir. 18, as other similar stories dating from late antiquity, was subjected to mutilation and reworking.⁶ Even if Speck's points, some of which will be discussed in connection with the relevant passages, do not essentially affect the following analysis, it should be stressed that they all result from a literal and not always justifiable reading and interpretation of the story. In writing Mir. 18 the author's main intention was not to make an objective report of a given miracle story, but rather to record reality through the emotional experience of the bachelor-hero.⁷

In the following pages I will examine this miracle jointly with Mir. 22 and discuss their literary and anthropological implications. Nonetheless, before providing the reader with a long summary of the contents of each story, it is worth noting that both *Miracula* are distinctive not only from the two other aforementioned sets dealing with one person, but from all remaining in the same collection in other respects as well. First, Mir. 18, which is merely the account of a burglary and the hero's quest for recovering what he lost, does not record any healing miracle at all and has a very loose connection to the "ordinary" healing activity of St. Artemios; action does not unfold in the church of St. John the Baptist in the district of Oxeia, but in its secular surroundings. Moreover, from the usual process of incubation only the element of the saint's manifestation in a dream is retained. The same holds true for Mir. 22, which is notably staged throughout in a precinct "competitive" to the saint's shrine, namely, the hospital of *ta Christodotes*.⁸ In this story the chanter is presented first as at risk for dropsy and then as developing a hernia on his genitals. The saint makes his appearance in a dream twice, first to the patient, then to a medical assistant.

These two stories provide much greater scope for a critical appraisal of contemporary society than the other forty-three in the collection; they are also rife with details concerning the life of the hero, a lonely bachelor residing in the Byzantine capital. This is noteworthy because the attestation of an individual living his entire life unmarried in society, without either religious obligation or a philosopher's *modus vivendi*, is without parallel in Christian late antiquity and has no real precedents in the Graeco-Roman world. A Greek tragedy's hero who professed the ideal of celibacy was Hippolytus, who had "a virgin's soul" and "rejected the couch of marriage";⁹ Greek comedy seems to have introduced an eccentric bachelor in the figure of Phrynicos's *Solitary* (*Movότροπος*), a work preserved in a few fragments.¹⁰ Lysias's two defendants, the Invalid and the one in the matter of the olive

⁶ P. Speck, "Der Eid beim Bild des Heiligen Johannes. Zu den *Miracula Sancti Artemii*, Nummer 18," *JÖB* 51 (2001): 159–67. His previous views were put forward in "Wunderheilige und Bilder. Zur Frage des Beginns der Bilderverehrung," in *Varia III*, ed. W. Brandes, S. Kotzabassi, C. Ludwig, and P. Speck, *Poikila Byzantina* 11 (Bonn, 1991), 210–47 (for Mir. 18, *ibid.*, 233–34). They were meant to rebut V. Deroche, "L'authenticité de l'apologie contre les Juifs' de Léontios de Néapolis," *BCH* 110 (1986): 658–59.

⁷ As precisely put by Speck ("Der Eid," 162): "durch einen naiven Realismus."

⁸ Text and translation of Mir. 18 and 22 in Crisafulli and Nesbitt, 114–21 and 130–36 respectively. Apart from these two miracles, only in Mir. 20 and 39 does no action at all unfold in the church of St. John which housed St. Artemios's miraculous relics. The former took place in the patient's home, the latter on the island of Plateia in the Sea of Marmara.

⁹ See Euripides' *Hippolytus*, 1006 and 14 respectively.

¹⁰ For his fragments see *Poetae Comici Graeci*, ed. R. Kassel and C. Austin (Berlin–New York, 1989), 7:403–9. I would like to thank Prof. Ariadne Gartziou, University of Ioannina, for calling my attention to this reference.

stump, are concrete cases of bachelors from classical antiquity; besides suffering from poverty, they both declared themselves childless and alone.¹¹

However, in spite of any loose resemblance to figures of Greek literature, references and allusions interspersed in both stories suggest that the lifestyle of the anonymous bachelor in the *Miracles of St. Artemios*, who lived alone in a cosmopolitan city like seventh-century Constantinople, was much closer to that of his modern counterpart than to any type from the pagan or Christian past. It should be noted here that there is yet another “lonely” person that figures in the collection; this is the hero of Mir. 44, a certain copper-smith named George, about thirty years old, who, afflicted with a hernia, lay in his own house and remained all alone (ἀνακείμενος εἰς τὸν ἴδιον οἶκον μένων καὶ μονώτατος).¹² Fiercely resisting the idea of consulting a doctor, he was brought to the shrine of St. Artemios where he practiced incubation for two days; afraid of having his lodging burglarized, he returned home, whereupon he was finally visited by the saint and had his health restored. Although his life is far from being recounted in circumstantial detail, and his story is no more than a rather typical case of cure “outside” of St. Artemios’s shrine, it is worth underscoring that his common features with the bachelor chanter were dictated by a similar lifestyle: living all alone and risking burglary.

From what the anonymous author records it can be inferred that the lifetime of the hero of Mir. 18 and 22 coincided with the reigns of Emperors Herakleios (610–641) and Constans II (641–668). More precisely, in the opening lines of Mir. 18, we are told that at the time of the composition of the collection this person was still alive, having been alone for fifty-two years, performing his chanting duties in the church of St. John the Baptist, where the relics of St. Artemios were kept; also in the introductory lines we are informed that he attended the all-night vigil of St. John from a tender age (ἐκ νεαρᾶς ἡλικίας). In Mir. 22 the same person is portrayed as sixty-two years old and as having served the same church since the age of ten. Considering that the collection was composed between 658 and 668, and assuming that the author is writing not much later than the events of Mir. 22 (when the bachelor was well on in years),¹³ we may surmise that the latter’s hospitalization occurred not long before or still in the last decade of the reign of Constans II. It thus follows that the hero was born toward the end of the sixth or the beginning of the seventh century and that at a quite young age, ten at least, he started living alone, perhaps because

¹¹ See *On the Refusal of a Pension to the Invalid*, 7: ἐμοὶ γὰρ ὁ μὲν πατὴρ κατέλιπτεν οὐδέν, τὴν δὲ μητέρα τελευτήσασαν πέπαιμαι τρέφων τρίτον ἔτος τοντί, παῖδες δέ μοι οὔπω εἰσίν οἵ με θεραπεύσουσι; trans. W. R. M. Lamb (Cambridge, Mass.–London, 1967), 521: “my father left me nothing and I have only ceased supporting my mother on her decease two years ago; while as yet I have no children to take care of me.” Likewise, *Defence in the Matter of the Olive Stump*, 41: ἄπαις μὲν ὁν καὶ μόνος, ἐρήμου δὲ τοῦ οἴκου γενομένου, μητρὸς δὲ πάντων ἐνδεοῦς; trans., ibid., 167: “I am childless and alone, my house would be abandoned, my mother would be in utter penury.” For this reference I would like to thank Prof. Mary Mantziou, University of Ioannina.

¹² See Crisafulli and Nesbitt, 218.24–28; the text does not specify whether he was a bachelor or a widower.

¹³ *Termini post* and *ante quem* derive from Mir. 23 and 41 where the author states that a youth was cured “in the eighteenth year of the reign of our divinely supported emperor Constantine, son of Constantine and grandson of Herakleios on the fourth day in the month of October”; see S. Kougeas, *Λαογραφία* 3 (1911–12): 278–79; and Déroche, “Pourquoi,” 97. P. Speck, who disputed the “authenticity” of certain references to icons, considered that the collection was not put together all at once and held that its final redaction is datable to the period after the restoration of icons (843); see “Wunderheilige und Bilder,” 210–47. Haldon (“Essay,” 33–35 [as above, note 1]), favored the idea that the final text may be later than the Council in Trullo (692); yet, in agreement with Speck, he did not exclude the possibility of a final redaction in the post-iconoclastic era.

he was orphaned. As for Mir. 18, placed in the reign of Herakleios, known to have died in March 641, we can deduce only that it took place on 24 June in some year between 615 and 639. A *terminus post quem* is established by the mention of the hexagram, a silver coin introduced in 615. Virgil Crisafulli and John Nesbitt went further in suggesting that the story is datable to one of the years 619, 624, and 630, when 24 June, the feast day of St. John the Baptist's birth, fell on a Sunday.¹⁴ This was based on the assumption that the all-night vigil in St. John the Baptist's church in the district of Oxeia took place every Saturday, according to the testimony of Mir. 15, lines 20–21. However, the *pannychis* in Mir. 18 was not an ordinary one, but a special office celebrating the birthday of John the Baptist, the saint to whom the church in question was dedicated; it could, therefore, have fallen on any day of the week. Besides, it is most unlikely that a judicial activity such as that of the eparch at the end of the story was not suspended on the Lord's day.¹⁵ This being so, the precise feast day of St. John the Baptist must have fallen in any other year than those suggested. Apart from the protagonist, the author mentions as still living a certain Drosos "who is presently *sekretarios*, but was then the *komentaresios* of Alexandros of Perada";¹⁶ of course, were it possible to know the conditions and the time when promotions of this kind occurred, we would be able to infer or surmise the years separating the events of Mir. 18 from their literary reconstruction.

The central theme of this episode (Mir. 18) is the burglary of the bachelor's clothes and his attempts to regain possession. The story is set on 24 June (when the birthday of St. John the Baptist is celebrated), during the reign of Emperor Herakleios. Taking advantage of the hero's absence for the all-night vigil, a burglar broke into his house. The bachelor became aware of the theft not upon his return home, but after waking up and looking for the splendid clothes that he would wear in St. John's honor. Finding none, he launched an investigation among his neighbors, but to no avail. Seeing him in despair, they suggested that he visit the church of St. Panteleemon in the Rouphinos quarter where possessed men could give "consultation" and inform him about the burglar.¹⁷ The bachelor went off to the church in question, but upon hearing the cry of such a man he became conscious of his sinful conduct and exclaimed: "Now I am forsaking God and approaching demons; now I have been robbed of and lost my soul."¹⁸ In a state of dejection (*ἀθυμία*) he went back home, fell into his bed and into sleep by the second hour. Lacking as he did a change of clothes, he decided not to go to mass.

¹⁴ See Crisafulli and Nesbitt, 251; taking this assumption for granted, that Mir. 18 dates from 619–630, I falsely argued that the hero might have been about thirty or younger on the day his clothes were stolen; see my review in *JÖB* 49 (1999): 350.

¹⁵ Cf. S. N. Troianos, "Οἱ ημέρες αργίας στα βυζαντινά δικαστήρια," *Dike International* (Feb. 2002): 202–29, also printed in *Τιμητικός τόμος του Κώστα Ε. Μπέη ως σύνος της αρτικής διαλεκτικής* (Athens, 2003), 4121–52; on other activities held on Sundays that were disapproved by canon law and other sources, see G. Dagron, "Jamais le dimanche," in *EYYXYXIA. Mélanges offerts à Hélène Ahrweiler*, *Byzantina Sorbonensis* 16 (Paris, 1998), 1:165–75.

¹⁶ Crisafulli and Nesbitt, 118.21–22.

¹⁷ Επίστασις, the term used here, literally meaning "act of standing-over," is also attested in pagan inscriptions and in the *Ecclesiastical History* of Eusebios of Caesarea; see F. R. Trombley, "Religious Experience in Late Antiquity: Theological Ambivalence and Christianization," *BMGS* 24 (2000): 35–36, 43 and n. 177.

¹⁸ Déroche ("Pourquoi," 101–2) suggested that a discreet denunciation of the healing practices of this sanctuary lay behind this passage. However, as the church is presented as a "diabolical" source of information, denunciation is not so discreet; cf. Crisafulli and Nesbitt, 252.

It was during this early morning sleep that St. Artemios appeared to the bachelor in the garb of a man wearing civilian clothes (*παγανά*) and reproached him for not having attended the procession of the holy objects. The bachelor excused himself by referring to his stolen garments, and the saint retorted that he would reveal the thief to him on the condition that he would swear not to do him any harm. Despite the victim's positive response, the saint made him take an oath before the icon of St. John. The man declared that, should he find his lost property, he would make his thief a good friend and even give him a gift.¹⁹ The dream ends by disclosing the name of Theodosios the chanter as the culprit.

Waking up at the seventh hour, and now in a good mood, the hero went to meet Abraamios the moneymonger who lived close to the church of St. John. This person was the treasurer of the society of all-night vigil celebrants. Abraamios reproved the chanter for his absence from the morning procession and asked him to give back the candle and pay a fine; the man related his adventure and what was revealed to him in the dream about the name of the burglar. Along with others, this person happened to be playing dice opposite the moneymonger and eavesdropped on the telling of the story. While the victim was relating the same story to those sitting nearby, the suspected thief came up in front of them, furiously inquiring whether he was indeed accused of burglary. Fearing for a moment that Theodosios would never acknowledge his guilt publicly, our man pretended to have said only that "if Theodosios desires, the belongings will be found." But on the latter's insistence, he bluntly exclaimed that someone told him while sleeping that Theodosios was the burglar. Then the latter asked the victim to give him a list of his stolen articles and left, assuring him that his problem would be solved before long.²⁰ And, indeed, by the eighth hour he brought his brother, who was held prisoner by a certain Drosos, "who is presently *sekretarios*, but was then the *komentaresios* of Alexandros of Perada."²¹ The man was wearing the stolen clothes and was brought to the *praetorion* of the city prefect Theodoros along with his brother Theodosios and the victim, at that time still forgetful of his oath.²² When

¹⁹ Considering this second oath in the same dream "suspicious," Speck held that this was a later interpolation; see "Der Eid," 161–62 and 166; however, should these lines be regarded as an intentional interpolation, the dream—and the story as a whole—would be bereft of much of its playful tone, so evident in this collection. Also, arguing that the formula *κατ' αὐτοῦ μοι ὅμοσον* should be taken as being pronounced "against the thief," and not as "an oath by St. John the Baptist (as on the icon)," can be dismissed by the linguistic evidence of Mir. 18 alone: at the end of the story the victim extracts an oath from the *sekretarios* by God and the salvation of the emperors (*κατὰ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τῆς τῶν βασιλέων σωτηρίας*). For actual oaths of this type cf. R. S. Bagwell and K. A. Worp, *Chronological Systems of Byzantine Egypt*, 2d ed. (Leiden, 2004), 287–89.

²⁰ Speck ("Der Eid," 165) is right in suggesting that for the thief Theodosios the list would have served as proof that the clothes were borrowed for the wedding banquet.

²¹ On the office of *commentariensis* charged with the execution of punishments, see Ioannes Lydos, *De magistratibus* 3.16–19, ed. and trans. A. C. Bandy, *Ioannes Lydus On Powers* (Philadelphia, 1983), 158–60. Interestingly enough, this author reports that "the prefect, either whenever he was encouraged by the emperor or whenever he himself was moved in accordance with the law and was eager to present before the law any magistrate whatsoever or anyone of the subjects, was wont to take the *commentariensis* as confidential secretary and to turn over to him the business that was to be done"; see *ibid.*, 161. Cf. also G. Dagron, *Naissance d'une capitale. Constantinople et ses institutions de 330 à 451*, 2d ed. (Paris, 1984), 235; and A. H. M. Jones, *The Later Roman Empire* (Baltimore, 1964), 1:587.

²² The *praetorion*, the office building of the eparch, was located on the *Mese*, between the Forum of Constantine and the Milion; see A. Berger, *Untersuchungen zu den Patria Konstantinoupolis*, Poikila Byzantina 8 (Bonn, 1988), 738–40; F. A. Bauer, *Stadt, Platz und Denkmal in der Spätantike. Untersuchungen zur Ausstattung des öffentlichen Raums in den spätantiken Städten Rom, Konstantinopel und Ephesos* (Mainz, 1996), 171, 186, 227 n. 82;

the eparch asked the *sekretarios* about the case, the latter secretly misinformed him that the clothes were lent to the brothers for a wedding banquet and that they had pawned them. As the victim was sitting at a distance and could not hear their conversation, he gave a positive answer when asked if the story was true. However, the *subadiuva* Theophylaktos, an under-assistant of the eparch,²³ came near the bachelor and said: “Why did you agree and say ‘yes’? Say that you were burglarized in order that they might be publicly disgraced.²⁴ For the *sekretarios* falsely testified that he got them from you for his own use.” It only then dawned on the victim that he had given an oath to the saint. Deciding thus not to proceed with the case, he took aside the *sekretarios* and the thieves and asked that they be set free. After extracting an oath from the *sekretarios* that they would suffer no harm and paying him and the *komentaresios* for their services, he got his things back except for his shirt and breeches which, out of compassion, he forfeited to the chanter-thief and his brother who was wearing them. Finally, keeping his last promise to the saint, he gave Theodosios half a gold coin.²⁵

This first episode from the bachelor’s life, covering almost four pages in the extant edition of Papadopoulos-Kerameus, is worth examining in various respects. Needless to say, like many of St. Artemios’s *miracula*, this story too offers a fascinating glimpse into daily life in seventh-century Constantinople. Yet, as has been observed, the tale hardly retains the character of a typical miracle story: no cure occurs, there is no doctor, no action takes place within the church, but everything is staged in the secular realm. Even the saint appeared not at night, but in a daydream. Moreover, the hero faced problems not of health but of stealth, which naturally expanded the story’s milieu beyond the microcosm of a healing shrine to that of public space and imperial justice. Although styling and defining a miracle is always a matter of interpretation, one may plausibly wonder why this story was included in the collection at all. Leaving this question aside for the moment, it is worth investigating the obvious points of interest that the story offers.

Seen from a literary point of view, the author did no more than adhere, if not to a *topos*, to a certain “edifying” convention: the saint reveals the thief to the victim on the condition that no action would be taken against him. In Mir. 3 of the collection of St. Theodore by Chrysippus of Jerusalem we hear that a most precious disk was stolen from two money-changers, the one being the master, the other his apprentice. As the former suspected the latter, he consulted soothsayers (*μάντεις*). Then the saint appeared to them in a dream urging the victim to rise at dawn, proceed to the church, and arrest the first person he comes

and C. Mango, “Addenda,” in his *Studies on Constantinople* (Aldershot, 1993), 1. On the prefect Theodoros, see *PLRE* 3B:1276–77, s.v. Theodorus 158.

²³ The *subadiuva* was responsible for indicating the time of day in the magistrate’s courts: see Ioannes Lydos, *De magistratibus* 2.16.26–32, ed. Bandy, 108–9, and 3.8.20–23, *ibid.*, 142–43. The office is also attested in a list of praesidial officials preserved in a papyrus document of the late 5th century: see *Corpus Papyrorum Raineri*, vol. 14, Griechische Texte 10, ed. G. Fantoni (Vienna, 1989), 82–85.

²⁴ Exposure to public disgrace was a practice following punishment and not a punishment itself; the only exception comes from a single case in the *Book of the Eparch* where bakers are punished διὰ δαρμοῦ καὶ κουρᾶς καὶ θριάμβου; 18.4, ed. J. Koder, *Das Eparchenbuch des Leons des Weisen*, CFHB 33 (Vienna, 1991), 130. See also Ph. Koukoules, *Βυζαντινῶν βίος καὶ πολιτισμός* (Athens, 1949), 3:184–208; for thieves and prisons, see *ibid.*, 209–24.

²⁵ Speck (“Der Eid,” 166) held that this gift was also a later interpolation “necessitated” by the insertion of the “second oath” in the dream of the bachelor-chanter.

across,²⁶ and concluded: “once you take the stolen object, leave the arrested unpunished.”²⁷

Quite different is the story of a woman from Antioch who came to visit St. Symeon the Stylite the Younger after her belongings were stolen. Once the saint revealed the guilty person to her, she returned home, announcing to her neighbors that she had found what she was looking for. Filled with anger, the thief asked her if this was true; and when she said that thanks to Symeon’s prayers everything was now with her, he shouted out, prompted by an unclean spirit, and confessed his act, revealing the location of the stolen articles. Following the people’s entreaties, the woman finally forgave the thief.²⁸ The same theme is found in a tale in the Life of St. Peter of Atroa, composed in the late 840s–early 850s.²⁹ The saint admonished the *notarios* Nikostratos, who was robbed by a man in his service, not to be depressed: the thief was to be arrested after five days, but the *notarios* had to swear not to take revenge.³⁰ Besides the command “not an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth” of the Gospels, abstention from judicial revenge may have been inspired by Christ’s counsel in Matthew 5:25: “Agree with [rather be benign to] thine adversary quickly, whiles thou art in the way with him; lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison.”³¹ According to that reasoning, St. Artemios’s concern, as expressed in his dream appearance, to “protect” the thief from harm and the judicial consequences of his actions is far from “curious” or deriving from the thief’s identity as a chanter and member of the sodality of St. John’s, as the commentators of the collection seem to believe.³²

Without deviating from this precise pattern, the author of the *Miracula* developed a complex narrative structure, enriching his account not with rhetoric, but with reality. As in other episodes of the same collection, a succession of details, names, and places constitutes the solid foreground for the veracity of a story that occurred on a day significant for its unnamed protagonist. Indeed, Mir. 18 takes place on the very feast day of St. John the Baptist, more precisely as the day dawned and in the hours that followed. Using both the form of a dialogue between the protagonists and a “chronicle” format in the narrative by giving precise hour indications, the author surveys various aspects of daily life in Constantinople. We see how petty criminality must have been a social problem, since those living alone risked being burglarized during their absence from home;³³ how a church ded-

²⁶ This incidental detail is also found in the film *Bicycle Thieves* (*Ladri di biciclette*), which is discussed below: the hero leaves the fortune-teller’s home with the prediction that the thief will be the first person he runs into.

²⁷ *Des Chrysippus von Jerusalem Enkomion auf den hl. Theodoros Teron*, ed. A. Sigalas, ByzArch 7 (Leipzig, 1921), 64–65.

²⁸ *La Vie ancienne de S. Syméon Stylite le Jeune* (521–592), ed. P. van den Ven, SubsHag 32 (Brussels, 1962), 1:160–61 (§181).

²⁹ On the date of this first redaction of the Life of St. Peter, see *La vita retractata et les miracles posthumes de saint Pierre d’Atroa*, ed. V. Laurent, SubsHag 31 (Brussels, 1958), 28–30.

³⁰ See *La vie merveilleuse de saint Pierre d’Atroa* († 837), ed. V. Laurent, SubsHag 29 (Brussels, 1956), 209–11 (§77).

³¹ King James version; the Greek text reads: ἵσθι εὐνοῶν τῷ ἀντιδίκῳ σου ταχὺ ἔως ὅτου εἶ μετ’ αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, μήποτέ σε παραδῷ ὁ ἀντιδίκος τῷ κριτῇ καὶ ὁ κριτὴς τῷ ὑπηρέτῃ καὶ εἰς φυλακὴν βληθῆσῃ.

³² See Crisafulli and Nesbitt, 253; the point that Christian forgiveness should take priority over judicial “revenge” was made by Speck, “Der Eid,” 166 and n. 19; in his view, however, this did not come about in conformity with a certain “hagiographical convention,” but after a “Christian reworking” of a story that rather had pre-Christian layers.

³³ In addition to the bachelor of Mir. 18, the one of Mir. 44 is also afraid of burglary; see Crisafulli and Nesbitt, 220.8–9.

icated to St. Pantaleemon was frequented, among others, by possessed men who offered information (ἐπίστασιν) similar to that provided by fortune-tellers; a confraternity existed at St. John's church, and some of its members entertained themselves by playing dice; remarkably, a petty crime like the theft in question, regarded as a manifest one by the Roman law and its jurists,³⁴ was not subject to bureaucratic complexity, but was immediately brought to the court of the city eparch,³⁵ a body of officials, styled τάξις, constituted the latter's assistants.³⁶ It is another matter how seriously the case was administered.

Nonetheless, for all their precious service to the modern historian, the concrete practices of daily life on which the story concentrates are not the primary focus of the anonymous author. The text is of an allusive and performative rather than of an informative nature; by setting the hero in a relay race for regaining possession of his stolen clothes, a banal story lacking wider interest, the author achieves two things: he implicitly criticizes the superficial character of human relations and promotes the cult of St. Artemios.

To begin with, the trial to which victim and thieves are dragged is little more than a parody. In fact, the hero is in several ways cheated. First of all, Alexandros of Perada, the *sekretarios* informing the eparch of the case, gives a false report that is concealed from the victim; the eparch pays no serious attention to the matter as he appears to be chatting (συντυχάνων γὰρ ἦν) and relies upon the private communication of his *sekretarios*;³⁷ acting as a counterbalance to what seemed to lead to an unfair handling of the case, the *subadiuva* Theophylact, also a deputy in the eparch's office, escapes the notice of his master, comes to the victim, and, by virtue of his familiarity with him, reveals the "fraud." This warning, however, serves only as a reminder of the morning dream. In the end, instead of having the thieves punished and the whole of his stolen clothes returned, the hero pays eight silver hexagrams to the *sekretarios* and three to the *komentaresios*³⁸ for the court costs and gives away his shirt and breeches "out of compassion." Essentially, in this court where the assistants "judged" instead of the eparch, the victim of burglary became a victim for a second

³⁴ According to the Roman jurists' teaching, "even if the thief is not caught in the place where he committed the theft, he is nevertheless a manifest thief if he is caught with the stolen thing on him before he has taken it to the place he intended"; see *The Digest*, bk. 47, title 2, nos. 3–4, trans. C. P. Kolbert (London, 1979), 103–4. For more details on the legal aspect of theft, see B. Sinogowitz, *Studien zum Strafrecht der Ekloge* (Athens, 1956), 40–42; and S. N. Troianos, *Ο “Ποινάλιος” τοῦ Εκλογαδίου*, *Forschungen zur byzantinischen Rechtsgeschichte* 6 (Frankfurt am Main, 1980), 111–16.

³⁵ This, however, should not surprise us since in the *Book of the Eparch* this official appears to be the judge responsible also for petty crimes.

³⁶ Dagron, *Naissance*, 233–39: τάξις is the Greek equivalent of the Latin *officium*, denoting the service of the eparch. See the short reference to the body of officials mentioned in this story by J. F. Haldon, *Byzantium in the Seventh Century. The Transformation of a Culture*, 2d ed. (Cambridge, 1997), 273 and n. 65. The relevance of this text to the organization and functioning of Constantinopolitan courts was first noted by A. P. Rudakov, *Ocherki vizantiyskoy kul'tury po dannym grecheskoy agiografi*, 2d ed. (London, 1970; first published Moscow, 1917), 118–19 and 203; the Russian scholar noted that similar material can be drawn from the 12th-century satire of *Timarion*.

³⁷ Although everything works so that the hero is finally reminded of his dream oath to St. Artemios, it cannot be denied, as Déroche believes, that the *sekretarios* deliberately gave a false testimony to the eparch; see his review of Crisafulli and Nesbitt in *REB* 57 (1999): 288.

³⁸ The *Chronicon Paschale*, ed. L. Dindorf, vol. 1 CSHB (Bonn, 1832), 706.9–11, informs us that from 615 state dignitaries were paid in silver hexagrams; this date was contested by K. Ericsson who instead put forward the year 626; see "Revising a Date in the *Chronicon Paschale*," *JÖB* 17 (1968): 149–64. See, however, the reasonable objections of P. Yannopoulos, *L'hexagramme. Un monnayage byzantin en argent du VIIe siècle* (Louvain-la-Neuve, 1978), 2–5.

time. However, in his view and the author's seeming view, this sequence of misunderstandings was so arranged that the promise to St. Artemios was fulfilled.

The expeditious trial of the bachelor's burglars is the third documented case during the mid-seventh century which involved the urban prefect and other high officials. The other two were far more complex and prominent, as the accused and condemned were such personalities as Pope Martin and Maximos the Confessor. The implications of their trials and condemnations extended from the rising ecclesiastical competition between the Christian East and West to the struggle between a "state"-supported heresy such as Monothelitism and the defense of doctrinal and ecclesiastical Orthodoxy. Pope Martin was judged in the so-called *cella sacellarii* on Friday, 20 December 653, and Maximos the Confessor in the Trullos of the Great Palace on 16 May 655. Next to the imperial *sakellarios* by the name of Boukoleon, the patrician and eparch Troilos played a significant role in the final condemnation of both. Not surprisingly, for all these three documented trials urban prefects may be fairly rebuked for a (tentative or not) misjudging of the cases they heard or pretended to hear.³⁹

The second underlying aspect of the story is of an anthropological interest. The hero is neither a pilgrim nor a patient; his association with the shrine is "professional." It is known from other sources that chanters serving in the vigils or in regular church services received a certain remuneration. Since no hint of a different occupation is made, it is legitimate to suspect that the anonymous bachelor made the whole or part of his living as a salaried chanter at St. John's church.⁴⁰ In Mir. 22 he claims that he had served the church of St. John from the age of ten; the words used are ὑμῖν . . . δεδούλευκα, which may be understood as "be at your service," that is, in a sense similar to their Modern Greek usage. One might also surmise that this lifelong engagement may have determined his "celibacy" status. Moreover, although the major concern over the clothes' loss cannot be established (whether poverty or misfortune), relying solely on textual evidence we may assume that this profession must have had meager income: the victim laments his "nakedness" twice for not having any other clothes to wear to the feast;⁴¹ the thief, also a chanter, pretends to have borrowed them to dress up for a wedding banquet. Furthermore, compunction as felt in Mir. 22 by the *xenodochos*, who accommodated him in the hospice, may have been prompted not only by the bachelor's illness and loneliness, as the text says (130.13–14), but also by his lack of financial support. This may be contradicted by the fact that, more than simply fulfilling his promise to St. Artemios, the victim gave away part of his clothes,

³⁹ For a detailed presentation of both trials, see W. Brandes, "Juristische Krisenbewältigung im 7. Jahrhundert? Die Prozesse gegen Papst Martin I. und Maximos Homologetes," *FM* 10 (1998): 141–212; on Troilos see 162 and n. 130; and *Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit* (Berlin–New York, 2001), 5: no. 8524. It should be noted that Troilos is not referred to as eparch in the extant sources, but it is almost certain that he judged in that capacity; see Brandes, "Prozesse," 162 and n. 130. On the contrary, the designation of a eunuch Gregorios as city eparch who played a prominent role in the detention of Pope Martin in sources like the *Hypomnesticum* of Theodoros Spoudaios (*BHG* 2261), written in 668, is certainly due to textual corruption: see Brandes, "Prozesse," 174 and n. 203; see also R. Devreesse, "Le texte grec de l'*Hypomnesticum* de Théodore Spoudée," *AB* 53 (1935): 73; and *Prosopographie der mittelbyzantinischen Zeit* (Berlin–New York, 2000), 2: no. 2367.

⁴⁰ On Byzantine singers, see *ODB* 3:1903–4. That church singers were paid an amount of money for their services is documented in the Life of George of Amastris, a saint of the 8th century: see V. G. Vasil'evskij, ed., *Žitija sv. Georgija Amastridskago, Russko-Vizantijjskija izsledovanija*, vol. 2 (St. Petersburg, 1893) = *Trudy* 3.1 (St. Petersburg, 1915), 29–30.

⁴¹ Crisafulli and Nesbitt, 114.19 and 116.10.

a rather considerable amount of money to pay for the court costs, and a generous gift to the chanter Theodosios. Whether self-sufficient or not, it is important to emphasize that the bachelor-chanter was, exclusively or otherwise, engaged not in an independent and self-contained activity, but one inscribed in the “functional system” of a church frequented by and serving the needs of a multitude of people.

As already noted, the action does not take place at all in the chanter’s “professional” domain, the church of St. John the Baptist. Yet it is strictly around this shrine and its confraternity that his social links are placed. Not unlike today, confraternities in Byzantium must have encouraged and organized regular churchgoing and been responsible for acts of charity.⁴² Albeit set in a cosmopolitan city like Constantinople and revealing many aspects of its public life, Mir. 18 is essentially staged in St. Artemios’s “inside world,” as it involves people linked, in one way or another, by communal bonds. In fact, responsible for the hero’s troubles was no other than one of his colleagues, the chanter Theodosios. Whether serving at the church of St. John in the Oxeia or at an adjacent church, the latter took advantage of the bachelor’s “loneliness” and broke into his house. In turn, it is the moneychanger Abraamios, a distinguished member of the confraternity of St. John, whom the hero directly consulted after his dream revelation, but this person is rather ready to scold him. Finally, another member, if not of the confraternity of St. John, then at least of its congregation, the *subadiuva* Theophylact, is the person who exposes his deception in the eparch’s court. Significantly, for someone portrayed as an anxious little man and an innocent victim, these bonds are of a contradictory function: what surrounds his profession is a source of good and evil alike. His personal feeling is that no real attention is ever paid to his case by a society which appears rather like a frivolous onlooker to a cause that meant very much to him. In reality, embarking upon the quest for his lost clothes, an investigation that turned out to be both rational and irrational, the hero was confronted with irony and indifference. Offers of aid were rather vague, and no real understanding of his personal problem emerged from small gatherings of people who spent their daytime sluggishly. From the viewpoint of his associates and the eparch’s justice, the theft of his clothes lacked any of the squalor or violence that would normally attract public notice. In contrast, for the bachelor and his protector St. Artemios, the claim of the stolen clothes, part of which was appropriate for the celebration of St. John’s feast day, acquired central importance.⁴³

At any rate, this clash of perspectives implies far more than the mere disparity between the public and private view of social snapshots. His colleagues and associates proved to be just as indifferent to the personal suffering of the hero as the administrator of law, the *sekretarios* Alexandros of Perada, minimized (or even undermined) the significance of his clothes’ loss. Thus all but implying the skin-deep character of social relations, the author

⁴² Cf. Déroche, “Pourquoi,” 100; Dagron considers that the expansion of lay confraternities in the 7th century should be associated with both the weakened role of the state and the diversified role of the church; in his view, confraternities can be distinguished between those fulfilling a sort of monastic ideal and those imposing obligations compatible with life in the world; the lay confraternity of St. John’s church had as its purpose the promotion of the cult of St. Artemios. See *Histoire du christianisme*, ed. J. Mayeur et al. (Paris, 1993), 4:36–38.

⁴³ It may be relevant here to state, along with N. Patterson Ševčenko, that “costume in Byzantium was so strictly regulated and determined by the wearer’s office, or role in society, that the distinction that we might make today between costume on the one hand, and insignia or even liturgical vestments on the other, must have been blurred”: “Costume,” *ODB* 1:538.

smoothly brings to the fore the isolation and loneliness of the hero whose only friend turns out to be St. Artemios. Yet, although the hero gets back most of his clothes, in the end his cause is justified only in terms of his relationship with the saint; for the thief, whom he was so desperately looking for, is found, apprehended, “judged,” but, after the charge was withdrawn by the victim, not condemned.

Maintaining the hero’s view always in focus, amid the others who belittle his cause, the story, though related in the third person, records only the silent monologue of an individual whose experience of isolation bears the mark not only of contemporary society, but of any urban and “civilized” society. If one had to find an equivalent scenario from the modern world, it would be Italian neorealism. André Bazin, a famous cinema critic of the 1950s and 1960s, defined neorealism as a cinema of “fact” respecting the ontological wholeness of the reality it filmed and making original use of nonprofessional actors and documentary technique.⁴⁴ Bearing this definition in mind, we may seek affinities with the bachelor’s story in one of Italian neorealism’s classics. The poor Constantinopolitan hero is looking for his clothes as Antonio Ricci is looking through Rome for his stolen bicycle in Vittorio de Sica’s film *The Bicycle Thief* (or, more accurately, *The Bicycle Thieves*—*Ladri di biciclette*, 1948). This film tells the simple story of an itinerary through Rome in search of the lost vehicle, which meant very much to a man who had suffered two years of unemployment. The little odyssey of Ricci and his son Bruno includes the police station, trade union headquarters, the open bicycle markets of Rome, a mendicants’ church, the apartment of a fortune-teller, a brothel, and finally a Roman street where the thief is found, but not apprehended.⁴⁵ Interestingly enough, Ricci’s seventh-century predecessor undertook a similar adventure, though on a lesser scale, in the streets of Constantinople. His cause too was met with indifference, and his attempts, rational or irrational, at locating the thief had eventually the same fate. Inexperienced as both were in legal affairs and other social mechanisms, they finally fell short of their petty quest.

However, in a twentieth-century context the “socially weak” hero is trying to find answers not through intercession from above, but by negotiating among different poles of power and patronage: justice, church, trade union. Often possessing the texture of a documentary, the Italian film transmits the atmosphere of a city and a society, if not hostile, then at least totally alien to the hero’s concerns. Apart from a denunciation of the deplorable situation that prevailed in Italy in the years immediately following the end of World War II, the insignificant case of a stolen bicycle had further implications as it also addressed the questions of loneliness and alienation of the individual within the amorphous and unsympathetic body of humanity. The only remedy suggested by the film’s final shots is the support and love that Ricci receives from his son Bruno. In contrast, living in a society dominated by kinship institutions, the Byzantine bachelor does not fit into any social group, and his very existence typifies a sort of social “exception” where, once again, the individual elicits support by transferring his sufferings to the saint.

If in Mir. 18 one may detect an implied protest against society’s indifference, in Mir. 22 protest is openly and frankly voiced against saintly inefficacy. As noted, the second episode

⁴⁴ Cf. *What Is Cinema? Part II*, trans. H. Gray (Berkeley, 1971).

⁴⁵ For an analysis of this film, see M. Marcus, *Italian Film in the Light of Neorealism* (Princeton, 1986), 54–75; D. Forgacs and R. Lumley, *Italian Cultural Studies* (Oxford, 1996), 261–64; V. Rocchio, *Cinema of Anxiety. A Psychoanalysis of Italian Neorealism* (Austin, 1999), 53–77; and, best of all, P. Bondanella, *Italian Cinema. From Neorealism to the Present*, 3d ed. (New York, 2001), 31–75.

from the bachelor's life is placed again not in the church of St. John nor in the streets of the capital, but in one of its charitable foundations. Departing from the wrong assumptions that Mir. 18 is datable to 615–630 and that in this story the hero was age fifty-two, Crisafulli and Nesbitt (p. 262) dated the events of Mir. 22 to between 629 and 640; yet, as shown above, their date must be later by at least a decade, that is, between 650 and 660. The hero, now sixty-two years old but still living all alone (*μονώτατον διάγοντα*), has accumulated fluid in his chest and risks being affected by dropsy. By the mediation of the *xenodochos*, he is received in the hospital of *ta Christodotes*⁴⁶ for treatment by its chief physicians (*ἀρχιατροί*) and their assistants (*ὑπουργοί*). For all their good efforts, ten months went by, but the hero's health did not improve; and what is more, a huge hernia developed on his genitals so that he was not able to join his knees together nor even turn to right or left.⁴⁷ Being a bashful character, he communicated his painful situation to only one of the chief doctors he was acquainted with. Astounded by the size of the hernia, the doctor struck his forehead.⁴⁸ On the patient's insistence, the latter diagnosed that it was due to old age and was incurable, thereby causing anxiety to the patient. Reluctant to have his treatment pursued any further, the chanter, left alone, broke into tears and started reprimanding his patron saints John, Artemios, and Febronia, those whom he had served since the age of ten, for not granting him the favors he would have enjoyed had he placed himself in the service of a secular patron. On Christmas Eve St. Artemios appeared to him in a dream as a steward (*μειζότερος*) of the city eparch Eulampios wearing the eparch's white belt; upon seeing him in such a garment, he thought to himself saying: "He was never before dressed like that!"⁴⁹ Behaving like a physician, he inspected the patient, pulling out of his armpit a surgeon's scalpel, and performed an operation on the ailing right testicle. However, no sooner did the bachelor think that he was restored to health and wake up in a happy mood, than he realized that nothing had changed. In fact, the very spot where he was operated on by the saint was constantly oozing and giving off a bad smell.

Ashamed as he was again to make public what had happened to him, on Christmas Day he demonstrated misanthropic behavior and refused to be served food. In the late afternoon doctors were absent from the hospital, and one of the assistants was taking his siesta. It was in the dream of that man that the saint appeared as an *archiatros*, urging him to take care of the patient's genitals. Upon awaking, the *hypourgos* rushed to the patient's ward, removed the patient's clothes, and saw by means of a lighted lamp that the hernia was swollen only up to six fingers. He treated the ailing part of the patient accordingly and did not stop rendering glory to God, the more so that the air was now redolent with fragrance. On the next day the same surprise was reserved for the *archiatros*, who in full astonishment exclaimed: "Believe me, brother, I have been a doctor for thirty-three years and have not seen such a thing." And the *hypourgos* replied: "Indeed I too have been an assistant for

⁴⁶ This foundation lay not far from the district of Oxeia; see R. Janin, *La géographie ecclésiastique de l'Empire byzantin*, I: *Le siège de Constantinople et le patriarcat oecuménique*, 3: *Les églises et les monastères* (Paris, 1969), 575–76; and idem, *Constantinople byzantine* (Paris, 1964), 330.

⁴⁷ J. Grosdidier de Matons considered that this was a typical case of filariasis; see "Les *Miracula Sancti Artemii*: Note sur quelques questions du vocabulaire," in *Mémorial André-Jean Festugière. Antiquité païenne et chrétienne*, ed. E. Lucchesi and H. D. Saffrey (Geneva, 1984), 265.

⁴⁸ For this gesture of surprise, see C. Sittl, *Die Gebärden der Griechen und Römer* (Leipzig, 1890), 13.

⁴⁹ The Greek text prints: ἐν ἑαυτῷ διελογίζετο λέγων: "ποτὲ καὶ ἄλλοτε οὗτος ἔφορεσεν." Crisafulli wrongly translates: "He thought to himself as follows: "From time to time he would dress in such a way." For the meaning ποτέ = οὐδέποτε, see Koureas (as above, note 13), 286.

twenty-eight years and I have never witnessed such a thing." The patient remained in the hospital until the day of Holy Epiphany. When the bachelor and the *hypourgos* were by themselves, they confessed to each other their dream visions which came about through the intercession of St. Artemios.

At first sight, apart from the same protagonist, Mir. 22 has little in common with Mir. 18. First of all, in terms of content, this story fits fairly well into the whole collection, as it refers to a miraculous healing of a hernia. Moreover, though not different in size, Mir. 22 is not marked by the swift and concise expression of Mir. 18, focused around an action unfolding over a short period of time; on the contrary, the text here is rich in detailed descriptions, whether these refer to the afflictions of the patient or other points of the account, as, for instance, the appearance of St. Artemios in the first dream.⁵⁰ Clearly this narrative technique conveys the impression of a more and more depressing labyrinth where the hero has been entrapped and the slow process of escape. A story about a disease should possess many more dramatic elements than a story of stolen clothes.

Once again, this miracle is replete with *realia*, especially as far as the function of a Byzantine hospital is concerned. Significantly, the picture of this foundation is not far from the ideal one emerging from the twelfth-century *Typikon* of the Pantokrator monastery, despite the fact that its doctors, not unlike many of their modern colleagues, were truant on Christmas Eve. In his comprehensive survey of the subject, T. S. Miller has discussed the various pieces of evidence that can be culled from this miracle story: how hospitals were administered not by a lay chief physician, but by a clergyman (priest or a deacon) attached to the patriarchate, how chief physicians worked in monthly shifts, how they were assisted in their medical treatment by *hypourgoi*.⁵¹ One point that escaped attention and can be added here is the strict distinction, in terms of hierarchy and career, observed between the *archiatros* and the *hypourgos*, as the one does not seem to overlap with the other: the former declared himself a doctor for thirty-three years, whereas the latter was an assistant for twenty-eight. The *hypourgos* was not ever an "apprentice" in training to become a full-fledged physician.

However, as regards the medical milieu, the most important point to make is that, unlike other collections and other stories of the same collection, the text does not betray any hostility at all to doctors and hospitals. In book 22, chap. 8 of *The City of God*, the first long Christian discourse on miraculous healing, Augustine relates the story of Innocentia who was afraid that the account of her miraculous cure would be greeted with blasphemous skepticism by her doctor; to her surprise, however, the latter praised the work of Christ. As has been pointed out, for all his descriptions of miraculous cures that saved people from the agony of surgery and physicians' despair, Augustine was by no means contemptuous of medicine and its practitioners.⁵² Hostility to medicine, as brought to the fore in texts of

⁵⁰ See Crisafulli and Nesbitt, 134.1–5.

⁵¹ See T. S. Miller, *The Birth of the Hospital in the Byzantine Empire*, 2d ed. (Baltimore, 1997), chap. 8, 141–66. The most detailed account of the duties of the *hypourgoi* is that in the Pantokrator *Typikon*, ed. P. Gautier, "Le typikon du Christ Sauveur Pantocrator," *REB* 32 (1974): 84–89. On the *archiatroi*, see *RE* 2:464–66; and V. Nutton, "Architatri and the Medical Profession in Antiquity," *PBSR* 45 (1977): 191–226 (repr. in idem, *From Democedes to Harvey. Studies in the History of Medicine* [London, 1986], no. 5); and Miller, *Hospital*, 152–55.

⁵² D. W. Amundsen, "Medicine and Faith in Early Christianity," *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 56 (1982): 326–50, esp. 349 (repr. in idem, *Medicine, Society and Faith in the Ancient and Medieval Worlds* [Baltimore, 1996], 127–57, esp. 151).

a later date, was the product of an increased claim of healing from shrines. However, miracle collections such as that of Kyros and Ioannes and that of Artemios depict a society where cure is sought scientifically and saints know symptoms, disease effects, and medical treatment to perfection.⁵³ In turn, the author of the *Miracula S. Artemii* gave excessive expression to opposition against doctors in only a few instances, in Mir. 24, 25, 26, 36, and 44. In the last two his criticism was rather indirect and passing, aiming at the avarice and the pain associated with the medical profession; he concluded Mir. 24 and 26 with a rhetorical sermonette rebuking the boastful followers of Hippocrates and Galen who cannot compete with St. Artemios, a former *dux Aegypti* who became a world healer (κοσμικὸς ἰατρός);⁵⁴ in Mir. 25, dealing with a man afraid of doctors who was finally cured by St. Artemios (now disguised as a butcher), he addresses, again rhetorically and ironically, a medical surgeon and poses the question of who could heal hernias by the use of butcher's tools.⁵⁵

Mir. 24, 25, and 26 introduce patients who come to practice incubation without consulting doctors first—a rare strategy—and who obtain cures by the application of seemingly medical methods. On the contrary, Mir. 22 is one of many instances which demonstrate that the Byzantines would first turn to doctors and not to saints for healing, and shows that the saint heals where doctors fail. Its particular interest, however, lies in the fact that its author not only refrained from adding an anti-medical tone to his narrative, where he could easily have done so, but he expressed positive comments regarding medical treatment in the hospital.⁵⁶ Already before the hero develops a hernia, the author pointedly tells the reader that, however futile the doctors' efforts, he "was diligently treated by them and to the best of their ability."⁵⁷ Nonetheless, going somewhat further, he consciously chose not to raise any opposition between traditional medicine and the saint's healing power. For, in the end, the miraculous cure effected by St. Artemios's double "intervention," the second in the guise of an *archiatros*, remains a sort of a secret shared by the bachelor and the medical assistant. In other words, for what really caused him a great deal of astonishment, the *archiatros*, the "representative" of rational therapy, is never given an explanation; along with his assistant he marveled at God's inexplicable mysteries, but was never to render glory to St. Artemios. Leaving aside its religious semantics, cure on Christmas Day was not accidental: the saint "usurped" the medical identity and interceded cryptically in the absence of doctors.⁵⁸

⁵³ See Dagron, *Histoire du christianisme* (as above, note 42), 4:87; cf. J. Duffy, "Byzantine Medicine in the Sixth and Seventh Centuries: Aspects of Teaching and Practice," *DOP* 38 (1984): 24–25.

⁵⁴ On the historical portrait of St. Artemios and the brief history of his cult, see S. N. C. Lieu, "From Villain to Saint and Martyr. The Life and After-life of Flavius Artemius, *Dux Aegypti*," *BMGS* 20 (1996): 56–76 and R. W. Burgess, "The *Passio S. Artemii*, Philostorgius, and the Dates of the Invention and Translations of the Relics of Sts Andrew and Luke," *AB* 121 (2003): 5–36.

⁵⁵ On the opposition between doctors and healing saints like Artemios, see Haldon, "Essay," 44–45. However, as regards the collection dealt with here, the variants of the author's approach toward doctors have not been noted.

⁵⁶ Although Déroche ("Pourquoi," 102ff) considers this collection the most aggressive against the medical profession, he notes the exceptional treatment of the *archiatros* in Mir. 22.

⁵⁷ See Crisafulli and Nesbitt, 130.17.

⁵⁸ The role of *archiatros* for St. Artemios is anticipated in Mir. 6 (88.1–2) where it is stated that the saint would make his rounds in the aisle at the left as if he were in a hospital (πάροδον ώς ἐπὶ ξενῶνος εἰσθεί ποιεῖν ὁ ἄγιος). Crisafulli's translation (p. 89, emphasis in original) is not so literal: "as if *he were a Chief Physician* in charge of a hospital." In Mir. 22 (136.19) the same expression is attested: τὴν πάροδον ποιούμενος ὁ ἀρχιατρός.

Though set in a hospital, the entire story revolves around a shifting perspective, from a comic to a tragic tone: as with many of St. Artemios's miracles, this story too is not devoid of the comic vision of life. The presentation of the hero's deteriorating health is mixed with "grotesque" descriptions of his bad condition or the doctor's hilarious quips. Humor in the collection is first revealed in the short Mir. 8, where the saint appears to threaten the Phrygian patient that he would double his hernia if he did not stop babbling. Humor is largely in order in Mir. 17 where the central figure, the Alexandrian actor (*σκηνικός*) Menas, also an unbearable babbler, suddenly develops a hernia.⁵⁹ His complaint that St. Artemios is an imposter and a bogus patron who does not cure, but creates hernias, is replicated in Mir. 22, but with a clearly melodramatic touch. Indeed, Mir. 22 is an emotionally charged story which reaches a dramatic peak when the hero is affected by a hernia; his situation may now look much worse, but, in fact, after ten fruitless months, this permits the saint specializing in curing hernias to act. Believing that all his hopes are dashed, the bachelor reprimands the three saints housed in the church of St. John and comes to invoke his lifelong attachment to the shrine which has not yet brought him any reward.

It is notable that, though departing from different ends, both the bachelor and the mime did not see their afflictions as a fatal event, that is, from an objective and abstract perspective, but as a break of a precise relationship. Their accusation against the saint(s) was pronounced for lack of efficient patronage and *συγκρότησις*, a word here signifying support.⁶⁰ The break for the mime came about at a stage of initiation, when he was to become acquainted with the saint; the break for the bachelor affected a well-founded relationship. Vincent Deroche has duly highlighted this patron-client relationship or, in other terms, this confusion of the sacred with the temporal.⁶¹ Clearly what the Byzantines expected of a saint coincided with what they sought in the secular patron.⁶² Interestingly enough, uttering his words of deep complaint, the bachelor uses the verb *προσκαρτερέω*, a word most frequently used in the collection to denote the practice of incubation. However, this very verb is also used in different contexts and with different meanings. In fact, Mir. 15 and Mir. 18 begin with the same verb. In the former, mention is made of a man *attached* (*προσκαρτερῶν*) to a man of prominence; in the latter, the bachelor is introduced as a certain man *attending* (*προσκαρτερῶν*) the all-night vigil of St. John. Encapsulating the notions of both attachment and expectation, *προσκαρτερέω* is a verb proper for use in the

⁵⁹ The exceptionally humorous tone of the collection was first noted and discussed by H. Delehaye, "Les recueils antiques de miracles des saints," *AB* 43 (1925): 32–38; see also J. Haldon, "Laughing All the Way to Byzantium: Humour and the Everyday in the Eastern Roman World," *Acta Byzantina Fennica* n.s. 1 (2002): 46–47. Interestingly enough, a similar episode is recorded in an epigram (bk. 12.83) of the Latin poet Martial: a certain Fabianus made fun of bathers with hernias until he got one himself.

⁶⁰ Cf. Mir. 17, 112.11, where the mime exclaims: "αὶ πατρωνία, αἱ συγκρότησις, οὐαὶ τῷ ἀγίῳ τούτῳ"; in a similar vein, in Mir. 22, 132.13–15, the bachelor complaints: "εἰ τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς ἀνθρώπων τινὶ προσεκαρτέρουν, εἴχον ὅν καὶ συγκροτήσεως καὶ ἐπιμελείας καὶ προνοίας ἀξιωθῆναι." The word *συγκρότησις* was rendered by Deroche ("Pourquoi," 107) as "la cabale" (= machination, trick), but, in view of its use in the second quoted passage, this meaning should be discarded. Cf. Fr. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden* (Berlin, 1925), s.vv. *συγκροτέω* and *συγκρότησις*, 2:500.

⁶¹ See Deroche, "Pourquoi," 107–8.

⁶² Cf. C. Mango, *Byzantium. The Empire of New Rome* (London, 1980), 158–59. For a summary of all different characteristics involved in a patron-client relationship, see J. K. Crow, *Patronage and Power. A Study of Social Networks in Corinth* (Sheffield, 1992), 30–33; cf. also *ODB* 3:1602.

secular context of dependence on an influential patron.⁶³ In other words, this transferring of social patronage to the sphere of the holy works in a critical direction: the more one considers someone responsible for one's own sufferings, the more one maximizes the chances of eliciting a cure.

Although the bachelor is protesting his lack of a patron, as a sick old man he appears far more “protected” than as a victim of theft. Naturally enough, in this case of a serious health problem, whenever required, his “network” of acquaintances seems to be helpful and, to a certain extent, functioning. More precisely, it is thanks to the *xenodochos* of *ta Christodotes*, who felt pity for his bad condition and loneliness, that he is received in a hospital apparently not accessible to everyone; the *archiatros* to whom he confesses his painful situation as he would to a friend (*οἶα δὴ φίλῳ*) is styled as an acquaintance of his (*γνώριμος αὐτῷ ὑπάρχων*);⁶⁴ the saint himself, as he appears in the dream, resembles a distinguished friend who is in the service of the eparch. In other words, friendship (*φιλία*) in the Byzantine sense of political or social support⁶⁵ is not absent from this story, but, as it turns out, it is not strong enough: redemption of the ailing man derives from a secondary person, an unexpected and instantaneous friend who serves the “*archiatros*” St. Artemios.

In a previous paragraph, Mir. 22 was juxtaposed to Mir. 18, as less concerned with earthly and trivial matters. In a sense, whereas Mir. 18 unfolds “horizontally,” having, to a certain extent, social criticism in focus, Mir. 22 largely develops on a vertical, existential basis. Nevertheless, this does not mean that these lines of personal tragic experience bear no mark of an implied protest. It is worth underscoring in this connection another “original” or exceptional feature of Mir. 22: the absence of names. One of the many precious services of St. Artemios’s collection to the historian and what serves to make miracle stories reliable, namely, their abundance of names, also typical of Mir. 18, is altogether missing here. Moreover, whereas the identity of the hero and all his cited “friends” is shrouded in anonymity, only one name is given, and it belongs to the most prominent person, the city eparch Eulampios.⁶⁶ In the name of his predecessor Theodoros, this high official of the Byzantine state, or at least his entourage, was not presented favorably in Mir. 18. In Mir. 22 Eulampios’s name has crept into the hero’s dream which includes a small operation performed by St. Artemios disguised as his steward. Although the patient woke up with feelings of relief, his cure was incomplete; final relief was to come from the saint’s subsequent visitation in the dream of the medical assistant. The fact that to conclude his ac-

⁶³ On the use of this verb in the whole narrative, see Crisafulli and Nesbitt, 235 and 246. As signifying attachment to a powerful person, it is also used in the *miracula* of the Theotokos of the Source, *AASS, Nov. 3*:888F. Cf. Preisigke, *Wörterbuch*, 2:403–4.

⁶⁴ It is interesting to note that, here and elsewhere, the author makes the distinction between friends (*φίλοι*) and acquaintances (*γνώριμοι*); see Mir. 21, where the hero Stephen the deacon is said to be ashamed to be seen by friends and acquaintances: Crisafulli and Nesbitt, 126.17. On the question of friendship among the Byzantines, see M. Mullett, “Byzantium: A Friendly Society?” *Past and Present* 118 (1988): 3–24 (but drawing on authors of the 11th century and later).

⁶⁵ Cf. A. Kazhdan and G. Constable, *People and Power in Byzantium. An Introduction to Modern Byzantine Studies* (Washington, D.C., 1982), 28–29.

⁶⁶ On this official, whose name also appears on a glass weight, see *PLRE 3A*:460, s.v. Eulampios 2; his date has been placed roughly between 612 and 654 by D. Feissel, “Le préfet de Constantinople, les poids-étalons et l'estampillage de l'argenterie au VIe et au VIIe siècle,” *RN* 28 (1986): 124 and nn. 26–27. However, in view of the date of Mir. 22, his chronology must be moved up to 650–660.

count the author did not confine himself to the dream of the hero, but rounded it off with another dream of a third person, again adds originality to the usual miracle-story pattern and makes us suspect a hidden meaning. Indeed, is this third person, the *hypourgos*, inserted by chance? Why is he the catalyst of the story, a role performed by the *subadiuva* Theophylact (an eparch's deputy) in Mir. 18? To answer these questions, it is worth exploring the world of dreams.

Apart from cures, collections of miracles also record dreams, since many cures entailed the practice of incubation. Dreaming was part and parcel of curing, as is more than evident in St. Artemios's forty-five *miracula*, forty-one of which include a dream, either revelatory of the healing process or *se ipso* therapeutic.⁶⁷ The dreamer-patient or a relative of his/hers is either shown the method to follow or, more frequently, awakes with his/her health restored. Singular though it is, since it does not refer to a miraculous cure, Mir. 18 also contains a revelatory dream simple in its symbolism: the saint appears wearing civilian clothes and investigates the chanter's absence from mass; then the chanter is told the name of the thief after taking an oath that he would not bring any charges. In his *Interpretation of Dreams* Freud distinguished between the manifest and the latent content of dreams and held that anxiety dreams may turn out to be fulfillments of wishes.⁶⁸ The dream of Mir. 18 is such an anxiety dream turned wish fulfillment.

As already noted, Mir. 22 is original in that it required two dreams for the cure of one and the same person; the first dream is complicated and requires a certain decoding, the second is straightforward. Analyzing one of his own dreams, Freud pointed out that there is an unmistakable connection between a more extensive group of thoughts and the narrower subject of the dream.⁶⁹ In the exasperated bachelor's instance, on the one hand, his wish to be cured gave rise to an operation carried out by St. Artemios; on the other hand, his complaint about lacking social protection made the saint appear in the guise of an influential friend. In fact, this friend also bears the insignia of the city eparch and is invested with the role of a physician. This combination of three in one brings into a single image all the recent significant experiences that have acted as stimuli for the dream. On the grounds that the sick man is both disappointed by the deteriorating condition of his health and fearful of further treatment by doctors, St. Artemios has been "modified" to appear as a serious-looking physician, performing a delicate operation. Also, the blame that the bachelor places on his patron saints for the persistence of his pains has caused St. Artemios to appear in the garb of a secular patron "strengthened" with the white belt, the key symbol of the eparch's authority.⁷⁰ However, in spite of his high expectations, this threefold combination caused only imaginary relief and eventually "mortification by grief" ($\tau\hat{\eta} \lambda\hat{\nu}\pi\eta$)

⁶⁷ Though stories of healing, Mir. 4, 17, 19, and 21 lack dreams. For a short presentation of three examples of dreams taken from St. Artemios's *Miracles*, see Trombley, "Religious Experience," 38–40. For the sociohistorical context of dreams, see P. Cox-Miller, *Dreams in Late Antiquity: Studies in the Imagination of a Culture* (Princeton, N.J., 1994), esp. 106–23 (chap. 4, "Dreams and Therapy"); M. Mavroudi, *A Byzantine Book on Dream Interpretation* (Leiden, 2002), esp. 1–62 (chap. 1), 128–67 (chap. 4).

⁶⁸ See S. Freud, *The Interpretation of Dreams*, trans. J. Strachey (London, 1991), 215.

⁶⁹ See *ibid.*, 198.

⁷⁰ A symbolic interpretation of the eparch's costume is provided in poem no. 30 of Christophoros Mytilenaios dedicated to the eparch John of Amouda, ed. E. Kurtz (Leipzig, 1903), 17; notably, the costume combined black and white, respectively symbolizing his verdict of guilt and "not guilty." On this poem see N. Oikonomides, "Η στολή του επάρχου και ο Σκυλίτζης της Μαδρίτης," in *Εὐφρόσυνον. Αφιέρωμα στον Μανόλη*

ἀπενεκρώθη).⁷¹ Of course, this failure was not to be ascribed to St. Artemios; for, by virtue of his second dream manifestation to the humble *hypourgos*, his healing efficacy is in the end restored. As in Mir. 18 (but here more indirectly), the blemish of “inefficacy” is again grafted onto the eparch and his entourage.

The dream metamorphoses of St. Artemios involved some other men of power and social standing. Thus in Mir. 37 and 39 the saint appeared disguised as a senator, in Mir. 16 as a *comes horreorum*, that is, administrator of the granaries, whereas in Mir. 29 he was dressed in the manner of the *illoustrioi*. In Mir. 15 he effected the cure wearing the dress of a patrician, alluding perhaps to the rank of the man of prominence who was the patron of the patient.⁷² Positive also was the appearance of an eparch in the last dream Sophronios of Jerusalem saw before he was completely cured of an eye disease. Appending his own miraculous experience to the end of his collection of the *miracula* of Sts. Kyros and Ioannes, Sophronios saw Ioannes, one of the two martyrs, in the guise of the rhetor Ioannes, “the one who was duly honored with the office of the eparch.”⁷³

In their effort to promote the cult of a holy person, hagiographic texts contained elements of criticism, whether this applied to a particular figure or matters of religious or doctrinal interest. Recent analysts of St. Artemios’s *miracula* detected an intense engagement on the author’s part in criticizing rationalistic medicine⁷⁴ and in rebutting “those who expressed a certain skepticism with regard to the wonderworking powers of relics.”⁷⁵ In that respect, the collection was not devoid of strong anti-Jewish elements as well as polemical diatribes against heretics, no matter that these were appended only as an exordium to a few stories. This is not the place to discuss these views and examine to what extent such considerations might have been central or peripheral in the author’s mind. Still, the thrust of his criticism as it emerges from the analysis of Mir. 18 and 22 has little or no relation to questions of doctrine or anti-medical polemic; rather, it lies in another direction: contemporary society that gave no shelter to an individual who lived apart from family and other protective bonds. For reasons that the author’s contemporaries would have been readier to perceive than we today, in both stories the person of the eparch, representing political and social power and represented by two different individuals, the one figuring in reality, the other in a dream, was the subject of an implied criticism.⁷⁶ To be sure, this is not to say

Χατζηδάκη (Athens, 1992), 2:422–34. On the loros of the eparch also, cf. A. Kazhdan, “Insignia,” *ODB* 2:1000; N. Patterson Ševčenko, “Loros,” *ODB* 2:1251–52; and M. G. Parani, *Reconstructing the Reality of Images. Byzantine Material Culture and Religious Iconography (11th–15th Centuries)* (Leiden, 2003), 84–87.

⁷¹ Crisafulli and Nesbitt, 134.9.

⁷² See *ibid.*, 104–5 and xv, where Crisafulli associates this feature with the fact that the historical Artemios was a high official of Egypt.

⁷³ See *Los Thaumata di Sofronio. Contribucion al estudio de la “incubatio” cristiana*, ed. N. Fernandez Marcos (Madrid, 1975), 399, §22 (= PG 87.3:3673A): εἰς Ιωάννην τὸν βῆτορα τὸν ἀξίως τῇ τῶν ἐπάρχων ἀξιό τιμώμενον, περὶ τῆς τῶν ὁγίων ἀρωγῆς πυνθανόμενον. On the dream appearances of saints in this collection, see Fernandez Marcos, *Thaumata*, 64–68.

⁷⁴ Deroche, “Pourquoi,” 102–6.

⁷⁵ Haldon, “Essay,” 54.

⁷⁶ On their jurisdiction and political role to 451, see Dagron, *Naissance*, 274–94. Dagron’s prosopographical research led to the conclusion that an eparch would remain in office a full year and rarely more than two years. For a discussion of the office in an earlier and much shorter period, see T. Brauch, “Notes on the Prefect of Constantinople. A.D. 366–369,” *Byzantion* 72 (2002): 42–104. For the eparch’s duties as a judge, see F. Goria, “La giustizia nell’Impero romano d’oriente: Organizzazione giudiziaria,” *Settimane* 42 (1995): 263–68.

that the author's goal was to denounce the exponents of a particular political or judicial system, but implicitly to promote saintly over secular patronage.

The protagonist of Mir. 18 and 22 is a man with no family. A great part of his suffering is due to his loneliness and estrangement from society: in the opening lines of each story the author precisely underscores this feature. In the first instance he was robbed because he lived alone, in the second one his serious health problems were ascribed to his lack of protection from above. Be it by selfish obsession or not, in Mir. 22 loneliness is no less deeply felt. Indeed, Mir. 18 and 22 essentially represent a penetrating view of human loneliness. From another angle the author shows the hero feeling deeply alone before neighbors, pious churchgoers, judicial bureaucrats, and doctors. Public life in its wider sense seems alien to such an unattached man. Of course both stories cannot diverge from the norm and so they conclude with a happy ending; yet a tone of melancholy is apparent. As the victim more and more needs the support of other people, the author implicitly tries to elicit from his reader/listener a compassionate ear, dwelling on an undercurrent of gloominess.

Family, wherever it appears in the miracles of St. Artemios, is fragmented and almost never in its entirety; a third family member, whether a father or a mother, is absent. Thus we hear of a mother and her son (Mir. 11, 12, 28, 31, 36, 42, 43, 45), a father and his son(s) (Mir. 4, 33, 35), or a mother and her daughter (Mir. 24, 34). Mir. 38 and 39 constitute exceptions to this pattern as they refer to George surnamed Koutales, who figures in the narrative with both his parents. In turn, only a passing mention is reserved for parents in Mir. 21, where the deacon Stephen relates his own healing adventure. Scholars who have studied the role of the family in Byzantine society have stressed that from the sixth century onward the Byzantine family formed a social cell more stable than that of the late Roman period.⁷⁷ Moreover, it has been suggested that "in the absence of public social life, the one form of association that flourished in Byzantium was the family." Also "the family was not a final ideal of Byzantine ethics, since it was treated as a transitional stage on the way to celibacy and as a means of subduing and restraining human lust. The final aim of *homo byzantinus* was, in principle, a solitary, eremetical life, free from any form of social relationship."⁷⁸ If true, to a greater or lesser extent, for other Byzantines and other periods, this no doubt was not the case with the hero of Mir. 18 and 22.

Though a bachelor himself, Plato dictated in his *Laws* that should one remain unmarried beyond the age of thirty-five, he must be regarded as estranging himself and not sharing in the city and be charged with a fine according to his income (772c–774a). Utterly opposing Greek and Roman views on marriage and sexuality, early Christianity embraced the ideal of celibacy for all Christians, not just philosophers and priests. Such Christian authors as Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Gregory of Nyssa, and John Chrysostom emphasized the preeminence of celibacy over marriage.⁷⁹ On the contrary, the author of the

⁷⁷ See H. Hunger, "Christliches und Nichtchristliches im byzantinischen Ehrerecht," *Österreichisches Archiv für Kirchenrecht* 18 (1967): 305–25 (repr. in idem, *Byzantinistische Grundlagenforschung* [London, 1973], no. 11); and Kazhdan and Constable, *Byzantium*, 32–33.

⁷⁸ See Kazhdan and Constable, *Byzantium*, 32–33.

⁷⁹ Discussion in P. Brown, *The Body and Society. Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (London, 1988), 42–44 and 120–39; and J. Evans-Grubbs, *Law and Family in Late Antiquity. The Emperor Constantine's Marriage Legislation* (Oxford, 1995), 71–73. On the celibacy of Christian clergy as influenced by the ascetical

Miracula of St. Artemios saw celibacy in its “everyday” context and stressed its aspect of loneliness and marginalization. The question now arises why the author felt impelled or thought it necessary to include these two stories in the collection and why he was so reticent about the identity of his hero. However, before trying to answer these questions it is worth discussing who the miracle collections’ usual authors were.

In the Christian West the history of *miracula* began in the first decades of the fifth century when the posthumous miracles of St. Stephen were assembled first by an anonymous clergyman of Uzali in Cape Bon and then by St. Augustine of Hippo (d. 430).⁸⁰ It is known that in the Christian West miraculous experiences were registered in the so-called *libelli miraculorum*, the firsthand material on which collections of miracles were based.⁸¹ Trying to answer the question why the collections were composed, Déroche identified the case of the aforementioned Sophronios of Jerusalem who did it out of personal piety. Sophronios was inevitably led to more concrete objectives: to promote the cult of Sts. Kyros and Ioannes by showing their healing efficacy and by silencing their critics, whether these came from the medical world or competing shrines.⁸² Personal experience also gave impulse to the monk Sabas in the mid-ninth century to append a large number of miracles to his *vita* of St. Peter of Atroa and, like Sophronios, to include an autobiographical miracle, his own cure from a wound on his leg.⁸³ Can we hypothesize that the author of the collection of St. Artemios worked for the same or similar reasons?

Extending from the reign of Maurikios (Mir. 32) to that of Constans II (Mir. 23 and 41), the *Miracles of St. Artemios* is “an account of the many miracles of the holy martyr (miracles most astonishing), of which we have the knowledge of some by sight itself and of others by hearsay.”⁸⁴ This is, after all, what the author declares in the preamble, adding that these were miracles performed during his generation.⁸⁵ There is no reason to discard these statements and deny that the collection was compiled on the basis of personal experiences and oral communications. It is plausible to suppose that most of the short miracles of the collection, especially those placed at its beginning, were based on oral reports directly communicated to the author or previously set down in some kind of records, the Byzantine equivalents of *libelli miraculorum*. But which were those drawn from “personal experiences”?

In his presentation of Papadopoulos-Kerameus’s edition, Socrates Kougeas was the first to note that the *Miracles of St. Artemios* must have been the work of a man that had served in the sanctuary;⁸⁶ he also made the distinction between two sets of stories, the short

tendency that prevailed in the 4th century, see J. Goody, *The Development of the Family and Marriage in Europe* (Cambridge, 1985), 77–82.

⁸⁰ See *De miraculis Stephani*, PL 41:833ff; Augustine, *Sermones* 317–318, PL 38:1435–40, and *De civitate Dei*, 22.8, ed. B. Dombart (Leipzig, 1905), 575–81. Cf. Delehaye, “Les recueils,” 74–85; P. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo: A Biography* (Berkeley, 1969), 413–18; and E. D. Hunt, “The Traffic in Relics: Some Late Roman Evidence,” in *The Byzantine Saint*, ed. S. Hackel (London, 1982), 171–72.

⁸¹ Cf. H. Delehaye, “Les premiers *libelli miraculorum*,” *AB* 29 (1910): 427–34.

⁸² See Déroche, “Pourquoi,” 101–2.

⁸³ See *La vita retractata* (as above, note 29), 149 (§98).

⁸⁴ Crisafulli and Nesbitt, 76–77.

⁸⁵ Ibid., 78.2–3: ἀπερ ἐν τῇ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἐπράχθη γενεὰ.

⁸⁶ See Kougeas (as above, note 13), 279–80. C. Mango surmised that the collection was set down by an eyewitness or eyewitnesses: “On the History of the *Templon* and the Martyrion of St. Artemios at Constantinople,” *Zograf* 10 (1979): 40; the same view is apparently shared by Lieu, “From Villain to Saint,” 58–57 and n. 7. The

and “dry” Mir. 1–17 and the longer ones, filled with dialogues, details, and dates (Mir. 18–45).⁸⁷ Indeed, the author’s close association with this shrine is borne out by the thorough knowledge of the sanctuary, its function, and its surrounding space shown throughout the narrative. Nonetheless, there are instances where, we may suspect, in reporting the “reality” of miracles the author indirectly allowed details of personal interest to enter in; and, what is more, from a total of forty-five miracles, three stories should be singled out as direct reports of personal experience. As a matter of fact, these three stories are much concerned with the psychic portrait of the hero, focus on his emotional reactions, and singularly involve a high degree of intimacy with his life settings. In other words, these three miracle stories look not only outward to external action and event, but mostly inward toward the hero’s psychological ups and downs. The first, Mir. 21, is presented as an oral report and unfolds through the hero’s monologue. In witnessing his own experience the deacon Stephen offered up a great deal of his own sentimental situation and, as has been pointed out, unnecessary details regarding the main course of the story.⁸⁸ In their turn, Mir. 18 and 22 are third-person stories which are preoccupied not only with conveying the simple configurations of the miraculous events, but also with putting together extraneous biographical details regarding the chanter. In addition to information about his age and lifestyle, we learn that the hero “was inexperienced in legal affairs and had never seen a *praitorion*”⁸⁹ and that he was a bashful character.⁹⁰ To repeat, the bachelor-chanter is the only person in the whole miracle collection on whose life the author has and allows us to have a panoramic view. Miracles 18 and 22 are not merely another public testimony of St. Artemios’s miraculous power, but existential reports that retain a purely private character: in the former, the bachelor is the only person to know how the name of the thief was revealed and the only one to view the entire story as a wise arrangement on the part of the saint; in the latter, it is he and the *hypourgos* who exchange their dream experiences and ascribe the cure to St. Artemios’s double intercession. Whereas in Mir. 22 the dream is revealed to someone who, we may suspect, might have made the story further known, no such hint is ever made in Mir. 18. Is this due to the author’s omission, his direct contact with the victim, or his *identity* with the victim?

There are more signs suggesting that, like the bachelor-chanter, the author was an active member of the sodality of the *pannychis*. In the aforementioned Mir. 15, which narrates the healing process in naturalistic detail and, despite its place in the first and “early” set of the collection, is far from “dry,” we encounter an unnamed man “in voluntary service who was attending one of the men of prominence and who was devoted to the all-night vigil of the Forerunner every Saturday.”⁹¹ This person was frequently chided by a young man named Narses who was in the same patron’s service and was “mocking both the singing of

late Lennart Rydén hypothesized that the author may have been a priest officiating at the church of St. John: “Gaza, Emesa and Constantinople: Late Ancient Cities in the Light of Hagiography,” in *Aspects of Late Antiquity and Early Byzantium*, ed. L. Rydén and J. O. Rosenqvist, Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul, Transactions (Uppsala, 1993), 141.

⁸⁷ In fact, Mir. 17 is neither short nor “dry”; the same holds for Mir. 15. On the contrary, Mir. 19 is as brief and “dry” as the first miracles in the collection.

⁸⁸ As also noted by Nesbitt, 27.

⁸⁹ Crisafulli and Nesbitt, 120–21.

⁹⁰ Ibid., 130.23 and 134.15.

⁹¹ Ibid., 102.19–21.

hymns and those involved in it”; for all the persistent remarks of the adherent to the vigil, this contemptuous behavior affected even St. Artemios himself. When Narses finally developed a hernia, it was the devotee of the all-night vigil who not only counseled him to visit St. Artemios, but also conveyed him on a litter to St. John’s church. It does not require great perspicacity to note that the anonymous man of Mir. 15 bears many similarities with the hero of Mir. 18 and 22: he too was a devotee of St. Artemios, introduced in three different ways,⁹² and, significantly enough, one whose name is not revealed. This incident may have happened at a young age, if the wording of the text (ἔτερός τις νέος τὴν ἡλικίαν Νάρσης ὀνόματι) is to be interpreted “another young man, named Narses” and not “another man, who was young in age and named Narses.”⁹³ In any case, the author’s concentration upon the anonymous devotee’s dispute with Narses and his stressing that, unlike the latter, he was a free man and freely serving a man of prominence, make the author’s identification with the bachelor-chanter all the more possible. In the same vein, equally suspicious is the passing and anonymous reference to “one of those who frequented the night vigil” in Mir. 19; this person suggested to George, *chartularios* of the imperial *logothesion*, that he visit the shrine of St. Artemios. In Mir. 33 it is the author’s turn to betray his familiarity with the *pannychis* proper and the kind of *typikon* observed by the chanters.⁹⁴ Citing, as usual, day and time, he incidentally specifies that “it was a Saturday, the eve of the Lord’s day and the holy night vigil was being celebrated; after the *troparion* had occurred and the three evening antiphons.”⁹⁵ Also it is this very familiarity that must have prompted him to narrate the story of the widow Sophia who, after the healing of her son, became a life member of the *pannychis* and was still alive (Mir. 36). Generally speaking, those cited here and in one or two other miracles (29 and 40) form a cluster that is closely related to the *pannychis* and which, in one way or another, are those the author had knowledge of “by sight itself.”⁹⁶

There is no doubt that the author of the *Miracula S. Artemii* was a learned man. Albeit overwhelmingly demotic, his language is rich in vocabulary and not devoid of sophisticated prose. Most of all, however, the author proves to be well versed in theological polemic and in medicine, the latter not only by the use of its jargon, but especially by his descriptions of medical practice.⁹⁷ As Deroche states, this feature made J. Grosdidier de Matons suggest the hypothesis that the author might have been one of the *hypourgoi*, like

⁹² More precisely, he is introduced as ἐσχόλαζεν ἐν τῇ παννυχίδι or τῇ παννυχίδι σχολάζοντα, τῇ παννυχίδι προσεδρεύων, and ὁ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ (sc. Narses) ὄνειδιζόμενος ἐλεύθερος.

⁹³ Crisafulli opts for the first solution; see Crisafulli and Nesbitt, 102.21–22 and 103.

⁹⁴ On the *pannychis* and its place in the Byzantine liturgy, see R. F. Taft, “Vigil,” *ODB* 3:2166; and idem, “Mount Athos: A Late Chapter in the History of the Byzantine Rite,” *DOP* 42 (1988): 187–88 (repr. in idem, *Liturgy in Byzantium and Beyond* [Aldershot, 1995], no. 4).

⁹⁵ Crisafulli and Nesbitt, 174.25–27.

⁹⁶ Kougeas (as above, note 13), 279–80 surmised that the author may be the person hiding behind the words εἰ καὶ οἱ λαθέντες οὐκ εἶδον τὸ ὄραμα ἀλλ’ ἔτερος ἐπιστεύθη ὑπουργῆσαι τῷ θαύματι in Mir. 30; Crisafulli and Nesbitt, 262.20–21.

⁹⁷ His competence in theology is shown in the rhetorical sermonettes concluding Mir. 32 and 41. In addition to the medical operations described down to the slightest detail (see, e.g., Mir. 22), there are many instances where the author shows off his knowledge of medical terminology and science: e.g., Mir. 23, 142.20ff; Mir. 25, 146.20ff; Mir. 28, 156.17–20; and Mir. 29, 158.19ff. Also, in his attempt to disparage the medical profession, he even indulges in creating new words like διδυμοτόμοι (158.20), κηλογράφοι χειρουργοί (156.17), κηλοποιός (110.17), ψευδοτομίαι (158.29), etc. An analysis of the *Miracles*’ language was undertaken by Kougeas (as above, note 13), 281–86.

the one in Mir. 22, but attached to the “hospital” of St. John’s sanctuary.⁹⁸ However, Nesbitt has made a good case that, contrary to Mango’s reconstruction, the mention of a hospital adjoined to the north aisle of the church building is only figurative.⁹⁹ Moreover, many hagiographers who have dealt with miraculous cures can boast of a fair knowledge of a science the practitioners of which they harshly rebuke, and among them are the aforementioned Sophronios of Jerusalem and the monk Sabas.¹⁰⁰ Medical knowledge and religion were not exclusive of each other, and it may be no accident that, as epigraphic and papyrological evidence from the fifth to the seventh century shows, a great number of physicians were priests.¹⁰¹ Be that as it may, should we identify the author of St. Artemios’s collection with the bachelor-chanter, erudition cannot be an impediment. To be sure, no indication whatsoever is given about his “intellectual status,” besides perhaps the fact that he was specialized in singing the *kontakia* of Romanos, a sophisticated form of religious poetry. Needless to say, no counterargument can be formulated from his “financial status,” for poverty and misery preoccupied many Byzantine scholars.

To a greater extent than Sophronios of Jerusalem or the monk Sabas, the author of the collection of St. Artemios had personal interests in promoting the cult of the saint by writing his *miracula*. His association with the shrine was not ephemeral, but for life and “professional.” For unknown reasons he chose not to reveal anything about himself directly, but rather to report the miraculous visitations of St. Artemios to him as to any other patient in the collection. Nonetheless, his self-effacement was merely elliptic and partial; for, in narrating the episodes from the bachelor’s life, he did not keep the kind of distance he maintained from other characters, but inserted several biographical details concerning this person, which make him verge on an imperceptible and concise autobiography. As has been pointed out, autobiographical accounts in Byzantium were highly influenced by the hagiographical tradition of recounting stories, thus becoming a sort of “autohagiography.”¹⁰² In this respect, whether he was the bachelor of Mir. 18 and 22 or a person in close acquaintance with him and sympathetic to his “cause,” the author of the *Miracula S. Artemii* is far from being a case in point. Tracing a clear distinction between narrator and actor, he maintained the third-person distance from his hero. This kind of camouflage or “switch to anonymity” was not a literary “innovation” of his own, but a device by then familiar to hagiographical and historiographical writing. To give one example from hagiography, just before concluding his *Historia Lausiaca*, Palladios inserted a similar cryptic account of his

⁹⁸ Cf. Deroche, “Pourquoi,” 101 n. 17, who further notes: “L’état des données nous interdit de dépasser le stade de la conjecture, mais cette hypothèse a le mérite de rendre plus naturelle l’attitude de l’auteur envers la médecine.”

⁹⁹ This was first suggested by L. Rydén, “Kyrkan som sjukhus. Om den helige Artemios’ mirakler,” *Religion och Bibel* 44 (1985): 15 n. 15; and idem, “Gaza, Emesa,” 142; cf. Crisafulli and Nesbitt, 11–12 and 237.

¹⁰⁰ On the medical erudition of Sophronios, see Dagron, *Histoire du christianisme*, 4:87; he assigns it to the teaching of Stephanos the Sophist, referred to as the teacher of Sophronios and John Moschos in *Pratum Spirituale*, PG 87.3:292–93. Different was the evaluation of Sophronios by Th. Nissen, “Sophronios-Studien III. Medizin und Magie bei Sophronios,” *BZ* 39 (1939): 349–81. Sabas’s medical knowledge is shown in his detailed descriptions of the pathology of diseases: see *La vita retractata*, 157 (§104), 161 (§107), or 169–70 (§114).

¹⁰¹ See G. Dagron and D. Feissel, *Inscriptions de Cilicie* (Paris, 1987), 196; L. MacCoull, “P. Lond. Copt. I 1077: Taxes in Money in Seventh-century Egypt,” *OCP* 67 (2001): 390, 392, 429, 434. On the whole question cf. D. J. Constantelos, “Physician-Priests in the Medieval Greek Church,” *GOTR* 12 (1966–67): 141–53; and E. Papagianni, “Ἐπιτρεπόμενες καὶ ἀπαγορευμένες κοσμικὲς ἐνασχολήσεις τοῦ βυζαντινοῦ κλήρου,” *Δ’ Πανελλήνιο Ιστορικὸ Συνέδριο. Πρακτικά* (Thessalonike, 1983), 151–52 and n. 39 (with examples from different periods).

¹⁰² See M. Hinterberger, “Autobiography and Hagiography in Byzantium,” *SOSl* 75 (2000): 145.

life by reporting on a brother who victoriously fought against temptations, even though he visited 106 cities. As the author of the *Miracula*, he kept the name of the hero concealed, but did not refrain from providing other clues that might allow him to be identified.¹⁰³ To be sure, in the case of the compiler of St. Artemios's collection, camouflage, whether auto-biographical or not, was not merely dictated by rhetorical rules and the restraints of Christian humility but was something much more intended or carefully set up. To some extent, parallels of the kind could be culled from historiographical writing where the author chose not to reveal his presence in the narrative. Toward the end of his chap. 24, Gibbon suggested that the anonymous officer mentioned by Ammianus Marcellinus at the election of Emperor Jovian in 363 was no other than Ammianus himself.¹⁰⁴ Similarly, in book 6.61 of his *Chronographia*, Michael Psellos refers to an unnamed courtier, "a subtle flatterer," who, whispering half of a Homeric verse, alluded to Maria Skleraina's beauty; this person may have been Psellos himself, who claims that he was present on the occasion.¹⁰⁵ To repeat, it is really puzzling why, apart from the bachelor himself, all but one of the persons mentioned in Mir. 22 are also hidden in anonymity. Is it because his tentatively vexing allusions would have somehow affected the author personally? Or does it derive from his further concern not to identify himself among figures that, unlike those named in Mir. 18, dating as it seems from "olden" times, must have been his immediate contemporaries?

Whatever may be the answer to these questions, we can infer that the author of the *Miracula S. Artemii* was a complex and intense individual who, like many Byzantine authors, occasionally took refuge in literary affectation. His writing avoids the conventions of miracle storytelling. He faithfully serves realism, but at the same time transcends its limitations and simplicities. In spite of modern views that have considered the *Miracles of St. Artemios* not authored stories but an oral history of St. John's shrine,¹⁰⁶ the analysis undertaken here has shown that the raw material of real life was converted into literature. For all its faithful representation of reality and its simple story, no one would refuse to consider De Sica's *Ladri di biciclette* a work of art. Yet a Byzantine miracle story dealing with an insignificant theft, bearing as it does many similarities with the story of the Italian film, would be hard to qualify as a piece of literature. However, like any other Byzantine author, the author of St. Artemios's *miracula* should be judged not according to his subject matter and themes, but by the standards of originality and inventiveness that he has infused into them. In addition to the plurality of his language, basic qualifying criteria for establishing the literary character of this work include some of the features underscored throughout this study: a complicated plot reaching a climax, followed by a usually hasty dénouement, long dialogue portions for satirical and dramatic purposes, and, above all, the plethora of its heroes alongside the plethora of St. Artemios's dream metamorphoses.

The author of the *Miracles of St. Artemios* did not deal at all with what history would consider the pressing issues of the time: Arab expansion and shrinkage of the Roman Empire.

¹⁰³ See C. Mohrmann, J. M. Bartelink, and M. Barchiesi, *La storia Lausiaca* (Verona, 1975), XII; the example of Palladios is cited and discussed by Hinterberger, "Autobiography," 154. Cf. also the examples of John Climacus and Anastasios of Sinaï discussed by B. Flusin, "Démons et Sarrasins. L'auteur et le propos des *Dièges stérikiaka d'Anastase le Sinaïte*," *TM* 11 (1991): 397–400.

¹⁰⁴ See chap. 25.5 in Ammianus Marcellinus. *Römische Geschichte. Dritter Teil. Bücher 22–25*, ed. W. Seyfarth (Berlin, 1970), 174.

¹⁰⁵ See *Imperatori di Bisanzio (Cronografia)*, ed. S. Impellizzeri (Milan, 1984), 221; cf. A. Kaldellis, *The Argument of Psellos' Chronographia* (Leiden, 1999), 140.

¹⁰⁶ Nesbitt, 27.

It may be that, like many of his contemporaries, whether historiographers, poets, or theologians, he too suffered from what has been termed “cultural introversion” or “shrinking of historical horizons.”¹⁰⁷ In a way, he calls our attention to what contemporary society and modern Byzantinists, as yet keen on generalizations regardless of textual or other evidence, have for long ignored: the microcosm of an outsider and the other Byzantium. Ihor Ševčenko defined this other Byzantium as the Byzantium of flesh and blood, the real world of poor people, of smells, of cruelty and of passion, of greed and of concrete suffering.¹⁰⁸ Needless to say, most of these sensual features do apply to the two stories of the seventh-century bachelor and invite us to discover their hidden world.

University of Ioannina

¹⁰⁷ See Rydén, “Gaza, Emesa,” 143; Haldon, “Essay,” 42; and M. Whitby, “Greek Historical Writing after Procopius: Variety and Vitality,” in *The Byzantine and Early Islamic Near East: Problems in the Literary Source Material* (Princeton, 1992), 70–74. Sharing by and large the same view, Kazhdan (*History*, 19–35) discussed the *Miracles of St. Artemios* in his chap. 1, entitled “Farewell to Historicity.”

¹⁰⁸ I. Ševčenko, *Observations on the Study of Byzantine Hagiography in the Last Half-Century, or Two Looks Back and One Look Forward* (Toronto, 1995), 18.